

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Silv Communications Inc.	)	IC Nos. 08-S002180
	)	08-S0294899
Complaints Regarding	)	
Unauthorized Change of	)	
Subscriber's Telecommunications Carrier	)	

**ORDER**

**Adopted: May 26, 2009**

**Released: May 28, 2009**

By the Deputy Chief, Consumer Policy Division, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau:

1. In this Order, we consider the complaints<sup>1</sup> alleging that Silv Communications Inc. (Silv) changed Complainants' telecommunications service providers without obtaining authorization and verification from Complainants in violation of the Commission's rules.<sup>2</sup> We conclude that Silv's actions did result in unauthorized changes in Complainants' telecommunications service providers and we grant Complainants' complaints.

2. In December 1998, the Commission released the *Section 258 Order* in which it adopted rules to implement Section 258 of the Communications Act of 1934 (Act), as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (1996 Act).<sup>3</sup> Section 258 prohibits the practice of "slamming," the submission or execution of an unauthorized change in a subscriber's selection of a provider of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service.<sup>4</sup> In the *Section 258 Order*,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1100 – 64.1190.

<sup>3</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a); Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996); *Implementation of the Subscriber Carrier Selection Changes Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Policies and Rules Concerning Unauthorized Changes of Consumers' Long Distance Carriers*, CC Docket No. 94-129, Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 14 FCC Rcd 1508 (1998) (*Section 258 Order*), *stayed in part*, *MCI WorldCom v. FCC*, No. 99-1125 (D.C. Cir. May 18, 1999); First Order on Reconsideration, 15 FCC Rcd 8158 (2000); *stay lifted*, *MCI WorldCom v. FCC*, No. 99-1125 (D.C. Cir. June 27, 2000); Third Report and Order and Second Order on Reconsideration, 15 FCC Rcd 15996 (2000), Errata, DA No. 00-2163 (rel. Sept. 25, 2000), Erratum, DA No. 00-2192 (rel. Oct. 4, 2000), Order, FCC 01-67 (rel. Feb. 22, 2001); Third Order on Reconsideration and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 18 FCC Rcd 5099 (2003); Order, 18 FCC Rcd 10997 (2003). Prior to the adoption of Section 258, the Commission had taken various steps to address the slamming problem. See, e.g., *Policies and Rules Concerning Unauthorized Changes of Consumers' Long Distance Carriers*, CC Docket No. 94-129, Report and Order, 10 FCC Rcd 9560 (1995), *stayed in part*, 11 FCC Rcd 856 (1995); *Policies and Rules Concerning Changing Long Distance Carriers*, CC Docket No. 91-64, 7 FCC Rcd 1038 (1992), *reconsideration denied*, 8 FCC Rcd 3215 (1993); Investigation of Access and Divestiture Related Tariffs, CC Docket No. 83-1145, Phase I, 101 F.C.C.2d 911, 101 F.C.C.2d 935, *reconsideration denied*, 102 F.C.C.2d 503 (1985).

<sup>4</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

the Commission adopted aggressive new rules designed to take the profit out of slamming, broadened the scope of the slamming rules to encompass all carriers, and modified its existing requirements for the authorization and verification of preferred carrier changes. The rules require, among other things, that a carrier receive individual subscriber consent before a carrier change may occur.<sup>5</sup> Pursuant to Section 258, carriers are absolutely barred from changing a customer's preferred local or long distance carrier without first complying with one of the Commission's verification procedures.<sup>6</sup> Specifically, a carrier must: (1) obtain the subscriber's written or electronically signed authorization in a format that meets the requirements of Section 64.1130; (2) obtain confirmation from the subscriber via a toll-free number provided exclusively for the purpose of confirming orders electronically; or (3) utilize an independent third party to verify the subscriber's order.<sup>7</sup>

3. The Commission also has adopted liability rules. These rules require the carrier to absolve the subscriber where the subscriber has not paid his or her bill. In that context, if the subscriber has not already paid charges to the unauthorized carrier, the subscriber is absolved of liability for charges imposed by the unauthorized carrier for service provided during the first 30 days after the unauthorized change.<sup>8</sup> Where the subscriber has paid charges to the unauthorized carrier, the Commission's rules require that the unauthorized carrier pay 150% of those charges to the authorized carrier, and the authorized carrier shall refund or credit to the subscriber 50% of all charges paid by the subscriber to the unauthorized carrier.<sup>9</sup> Carriers should note that our actions in this order do not preclude the Commission from taking additional action, if warranted, pursuant to Section 503 of the Act.<sup>10</sup>

4. We received Complainants' complaints alleging that Complainants' telecommunications services providers had been changed from their authorized carriers to Silv without Complainants' authorization. Pursuant to sections 1.719 and 64.1150 of our rules,<sup>11</sup> we notified Silv of the complaints and Silv responded.<sup>12</sup> Silv states that authorization was received through third party verification (TPV). We have reviewed the TPVs submitted by Silv with its responses. Section 258(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 (Act), as amended by the

---

<sup>5</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120.

<sup>6</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

<sup>7</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120(c). Section 64.1130 details the requirements for letter of agency form and content for written or electronically signed authorizations. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1130.

<sup>8</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1160. Any charges imposed by the unauthorized carrier on the subscriber for service provided after this 30-day period shall be paid by the subscriber to the authorized carrier at the rates the subscriber was paying to the authorized carrier at the time of the unauthorized change. *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1170.

<sup>10</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 503.

<sup>11</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 1.719 (Commission procedure for informal complaints filed pursuant to section 258 of the Act); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1150 (procedures for resolution of unauthorized changes in preferred carrier).

<sup>12</sup> See Appendix A.

Telecommunications Act of 1996<sup>13</sup> provides that, “no telecommunications carrier shall submit or execute a change in subscriber’s selection of a provider of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service *except in accordance with such verification procedures as the Commission shall prescribe*.<sup>14</sup> Section 64.1120(c)(3)(iii) of the Commission’s rules specifically requires that all third party verifiers “elicit, at a minimum the identity of the subscriber, [and] confirmation that the person on the call is authorized to make the *carrier change*....”<sup>15</sup> In each case, Silv did not satisfy this procedural requirement when its verifier asked whether the person on the call was “authorized by the telephone account owner to make changes to and/or incur charges on this telephone account.”<sup>16</sup> A “yes” response by the person on the call does not provide clear and convincing evidence confirming that such person was “authorized to make the carrier change” because the person on the call could have been confirming authorization only for incurring charges. The possibility of the person on the call only confirming authorization to incur charges would not meet the specific procedural requirement that the third party verifier “confirm that the person on the call is authorized to make the carrier change.”<sup>17</sup> Accordingly, we grant Complainants’ complaints. We find that Silv has failed to produce clear and convincing evidence of valid authorized carrier changes by Complainants.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, we find that Silv’s actions resulted in unauthorized changes in Complainants’ telecommunications service providers and we discuss Silv’s liability below.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a); Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).

<sup>14</sup> *See* 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

<sup>15</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120(c)(3)(iii).

<sup>16</sup> *See Reduced Rate Long Distance, LLC*, 24 FCC Rcd 2496 (2009). In that Order on Reconsideration, CGB upheld a Division order which stated that a TPV which confirmed that the person on the call was authorized to make changes “and/or” incur charges did not satisfy the Commission’s explicit procedural requirement that the verification elicit a confirmation that the person on the call is authorized to make the carrier change.

<sup>17</sup> *See id.*

<sup>18</sup> *See* 47 C.F.R. § 64.1150(d).

<sup>19</sup> If either Complainant is unsatisfied with the resolution of this complaint, such Complainant may file a formal complaint with the Commission pursuant to Section 1.721 of the Commission’s rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.721. Such filing will be deemed to relate back to the filing date of such Complainant’s informal complaint so long as the formal complaint is filed within 45 days from the date of this order is mailed or delivered electronically to such Complainant. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 1.719.

5. Silv must remove all charges incurred for service provided to Complainants for the first thirty days after the alleged unauthorized change.<sup>20</sup> We have determined that Complainants are entitled to absolution for the charges incurred during the first thirty days after the unauthorized change occurred and that neither their authorized carriers nor Silv may pursue any collection against Complainants for those charges.<sup>21</sup> Any charges imposed by Silv on the subscribers for service provided after this 30-day period shall be paid by the subscriber to their authorized carrier at the rates the subscriber was paying at the time of the unauthorized change.<sup>22</sup>

6. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 258 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. § 258, and Sections 0.141, 0.361 and 1.719 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.141, 0.361, 1.719, the complaints filed by Complainants<sup>23</sup> against Silv ARE GRANTED.

7. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 64.1170(d) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 64.1170(d), Complainants' are entitled to absolution for the charges incurred during the first thirty days after the unauthorized change occurred to the relevant Complainants and neither their authorized carrier nor Silv may pursue any collection against Complainants for those charges.

8. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order is effective upon release.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Nancy A. Stevenson, Deputy Chief  
Consumer Policy Division  
Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau

---

<sup>20</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1160(b).

<sup>21</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1160(d).

<sup>22</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1160.

<sup>23</sup> See Appendix A.

## Appendix A

INFORMAL  
COMPLAINT  
NUMBERDATE OF  
COMPLAINTDATE OF  
RESPONSEAUTHORIZED  
CARRIER

08-S002180	September 24, 2008	November 3, 2008	AT&T, Inc.
08-S0294899	December 1, 2008	December 31, 2008	Verizon